DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 780 JC 690 136

By-Jones, Milton O.

Student Protest in the Junior College; A National Survey of Student Unrest and Protest Activities in the Junior College.

Pub Date 68
Note-7p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.45
Descriptors-*Activism, *Junior Colleges, Questionnaires

A questionnaire-opinionnaire survey of 68 junior colleges in 30 states, explored questions such as the amount and type of protest on junior college campuses, the extent of faculty and nonstudent involvement, the degree of institutional planning for protest situations, opinions concerning the relative lack of protest on junior college campuses, and opinions concerning successful approaches to student unrest. It revealed conclusions such as: (1) student unrest activities are primarily non-physical, centering around food service, rules on dress and appearance, student publications, and student representation in policy-making; (2) 20% of the respondents indicated some active faculty involvement in protest situations; (3) 90% of the student personnel departments have plans ready for possible protest situations; (4) 45% of the institutions indicated that governing boards had taken no action on protest situations; (5) the non-residential nature of junior colleges is the most important reason for a lack of protest in these institutions; and (6) that attempts to meet students' needs and to involve students in policy-making are needed. (JC)

ED028780

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"Student Protest in the Junior College"

A national survey of student unrest and protest activities in the junior college

JC 690 136

By

Milton O. Jones Ph.D.
1968

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

APR 14 1969

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Student Protest in the Junior College

Student unrest and protest activities have increased markedly in recent years. Numerous articles have appeared in newspapers and journals, related to the subject and some organized research has been undertaken attempting to understand numerous facets of the present situation. Surprisingly, little mention has been made of student unrest and protest activities in the junior college. The present study attempted to determine the nature and frequency of student protest activities in the junior college and to obtain some opinions as to the reasons for such activities. An additional attempt was made to determine possible characteristics of junior colleges and junior college students which may or may not influence protest activities at these institutions.

SAMPLE AND PROCEDURE

The Directory of American Junior Colleges, 1967, was used as the source for the population. From it, a group of junior colleges were chosen which represented an approximate 10% sample of institutions listed. These institutions were further defined as colleges which offer both transfer and terminal programs with enrollments of 1,000 or more students. Such a technique resulted in a sample of 94 junior colleges representing 34 states.

A questionnaire-opinionnaire was devised and sent to the Dean of Students at each institution. From the original and one follow-up mailing, 72 of the 94, (76%) of the institutions responded. Four of these respondents indicated they would not participate in the study. This narrowed the participants to 68 institutions from 30 states representing a student population of 289, 375, and 73% of the original sample. Of the 22 institutions which did not respond, 11 were from four states including six from one large state, none of which responded.

INSTRUMENT

The instrument used in the survey was divided into two parts: a questionnaire section and an opinionnaire section. The first section was designed to determine the amount and type of protest on the junior college campus, the extent to which faculty members and nonstudents were involved, and the degree of institutional planning for protest situation. The second section of the survey was designed to obtain the opinions of the respondents concerning the relative lack or absence of protest on junior college campuses. Also, opinions were sought as to approaches which have been successful to preclude student unrest from becoming student protest.

Questionnaire: Protest activities were classified in three categories:

Level 1: "Non physical Protests" such as resolutions, petitions, and editorials.

Level 2: "Legitimate Physical Protests" such as non-disruptive picketing and demonstrations allowed or tolerated by the administration.

Level 3: "Defiant Protests" such as disruptive demonstrations, sit-ins, and clashing with authority.

Respondents were asked to indicate the level of protest activities which had taken place during the past year. Situations subject to protest on college campuses were listed and space was provided for respondents to name other types of protest situations which may have occurred on their campus. The results of this question are seen in Table 1.

Respondents were then asked to indicate at which level of protest they felt it appropriate to take specific actions. Space was also provided for those who felt that they would never take such action. Results of this question are seen in Table 2.

In order to determine the degree of institutional planning for protest activities a list of policy-making groups was compiled. Respondents were asked to check the degree of action taken by each group. These results are presented in Table 3.

Additional questions were concerned with degree of faculty member and nonstudent involvement in protest activities and whether or not legal opinion had been sought by the institution concerning response to student protest.

Opinionnaire : Junior colleges have certain characteristics which are different from four-year colleges and universitites (Gleazer, 1968; Martorana, 1968; Marsee, 1966; Garrison, 1966). Likewise, research has pointed to specific junior college student characteristics (Richards and Braskamp, ACE study, Christian and Wattenbarger, Seibel and Cross). Respondents were asked to rate a list of college and student characteristics by importance in relation to the relative lack or absence of protest on the junior college campus. Space was provided for additional characteristics not provided in the original list. The results are presented in Table 4.

The last question dealt with actions which might be taken to preclude student unrest from becoming student protests. The results are in Table 5.

RESULTS

Protest Activities: A study of Table I revealed that student unrest in the junior college has been primarily in the form of Non Physical Protest. Situations most subject

TABLE I

Degree of Protest in Junior Colleges

Situations Subject to Protest	Frequency of Response			
	None	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Dormitory or off-campus housing	58	8	0	1
Food Service	40	26	1	1
Drinking on Campus	65	3	0	0
Rules on Dress and Appearance	40	28	0	0
Fraternities and Sororities	60	7	0	0
Student Publications	39	28	0	1
Student Political Activities	46	19	3	1
Student Civil Rights Activities	47	13	6	3
Controversial Speakers	52	12	5	0
Career Recruitment	62	3	2	0
Allegations of Poor Teaching	59	7	0	1
Dissatisfaction with instruction	56	10	1	1
Controversy involving Faculty Member	52	14	2	2
Student Representation in Policy-Making	39	23	4	2

to this type of protest are food service, rules on dress and appearance, student publications, and student representation in policy-making. Most legitimate physical and defiant protests were in the areas of student civil rights activities and student representation in policy-making. Situations less subject to protest are drinking on campus, fraternities and sororities, and career recruitment.

For a geographical analysis, the colleges were further broken down by five regions. The Southwest included the states of Colorado, Arizona, California and Utah; the Northwest-the states of Oregon, Washington and Wyoming; the Midwest-Arkansas, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, North Dakota, Ohio, Michigan, Texas and Wisconsin; the Northeast-Connecticut, Maryland, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania; and the Southeast-Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina and Virginia.

When comparing regions, it was found that of the 16 colleges reporting from the Southwest, 11 had experienced some type of protest activity in the area of student civil rights while only 1 of the 14 colleges in the Southeast reported such activity.

When asked about involvement of faculty members in student protest activities, 3 colleges reported leadership role, 11 active participation, 22 passive support, and 32 indicated there was no involvement. In response to the question of whether non-students or outsiders were involved in any of the protests, 43 reported not at all, 19 reported to some extent, and 2 reported considerable extent.

There were no reported activistic clubs or organizations on campuses located in the Southeast, Northeast, or Northwest. The most frequently mentioned ones in the Southwest and Midwest were Black Student Union, (7); Students for a Democratic Society, (4); and American Civil Liberties Union, (3). In addition, 18 other clubs were listed as being activistic in these regions.

Actions Taken Relative to Protest: It must be noted that the response totals in Table 2 vary. This is due to the fact that some respondents checked more than one level for a specific action and several respondents did not complete this section of the questionnaire. However, a pattern may be observed concerning the level at which respondents feel it appropriate to take administratative action. As protest activities reach Level 3 (defiant protests) the action becomes more severe. Forty-two indicated that they would hear grievances at Level 1, 8 would issue warnings at this level, and only 1 indicated that police action was needed at Level 1. However, when protests reached Level 3 (defiant activities) respondents indicated that the appropriate actions would be to suspend ringleaders,to dismiss ringleaders,to call in police, and to take civil action.

TABLE 2

Level of Protest at Which Action
Would be Appropriate

Action	Frequency of Response			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Never
Hear grievances	42	31	12	
Issue warning	8	24	23	
Suspend ringleaders	2	2	42	1
Dismiss ringleaders	0	2	45	2
Call in police	1	1	47	2
Take civil (Legal) action	1	2	42	3

Institutional Planning: Of the 68 institutions, 30 reported that their Board of Trustees had taken no action to prepare for protest activites, while only 11 had adopted a policy. Most of the action taken has been in the student personnel departments where only 8 reported that nothing had been done. None of the 10 colleges in the Northeast have adopted any kind of policy to prepare for protest activities.

When asked whether or not legal opinion had been sought concerning the institutional response to student protest, 55% of the colleges in the sample group responded negatively.

TABLE 3

Degree of Institutional Planning
for Protest Activities

Group	Frequency of Response			
	None	Discussion	Plans For	Policy Adopted
Board of Trustees	30	14	4	11
President	14	18	14	13
President's Council	17	16	16	14
Student Personnel Department	8	19	23	17
Faculty Committees	25	14	9	8
Student Government	15	24	13	11
Community Agencies	35	8	2	3
Joint Committees	34	5	8	5

TABLE 4

Characteristics Considered Important to the
Relative Lack of Protest
in Junior Colleges

Characteristics of Junior Colleges	Frequency of Response		
	Very Important	Important	Not Important
Comprehensive nature	13	29	12
Non-residential nature	42	14	6
Open-door admissions	15	26	16
Second-chance nature	17	27	11
Fewer regulations	13	25	17
Faculty accessibility and concern	34	26	3
Counseling Student Activities	36	23	3
Student Activities	33	25	4
Student Characteristics	**Very Important**	**Important**	**Not Important**
More Practically oriented	19	33	9
Home and community influence	32	29	2
Economic Concerns	21	34	4
Part of full-time work	31	27	4
Academic Background and Expectations	9	38	9

Student and Institutional Characteristics: The opinionnaire was written on the assumption that student protest on junior college campuses had not reached the proportions that it has in other college settings. Respondents rated the non-residential nature of the junior college as the most important reasons for this absence of lack of protest. However, counseling, faculty accessibility and concern, and student activities were also considered to be important or very important factors. Curriculum, admission policies and regulations were not considered to be the deciding factors in the absence of student unrest.

When respondents were asked to indicate student characteristics which they considered important to amount of protest on the campuses, home and community influence and part or full-time work were considered very important. Three write-in responses indicated that student immaturity was a very important characteristic. In addition, write-in respondents felt that the two year characteristic of the college was very important and one felt that this was important.

Appropriate Actions: Table 5 shows that all respondents felt that involving student in policy-making and attempting to meet student needs and concerns as they arise were important or very important in precluding student unrest from becoming student protest. Thirty-nine of the 61 answering this question felt that banning protest and activistic organizations was not important, and four wrote in that this should not be done if the organizations were legally constituted.

TABLE 5

Appropriate Actions in Response to Student Unrest and Protest

Action	Frequency of Response		
	Very Important	Important	Not Important
Adopt a hard line to deal with student activists	9	14	28
Involve students in policy-making process	45	17	0
Attempt to meet student needs and concerns as they arise	57	7	0
Ban protest and activistic organizations	4	8	39

Several comments made by respondents may summarize the situation:

Arthur R. McCarty, of Olympic College described a protest situation that had taken place on his campus and the results of this activity:

"Improved lines of communication have been established which will involve the students, through legitimate student government channels. It is our plan to help make the student government a more meaningful and useful group by involving them (students) and making certain that some kind of action is taken on all requests by the student. The students went to know that their desires have been heard and considered, even if the decisions are contrary to their desires."

Albert K. Smith, Miami Dade-South: "In my opinion faculty concern for students and student involvement are probably the most important characteristics of the junior college that insure a favorable campus climate. In the event we do have troubles at the instant that operations are interrupted (instructional or administrative) immediate action must be taken."

Hobart P. Pardee of Norwalk Community College: "We have had no student protests, expect none at present. We have an all college council - equal student and faculty representation. Students may be represented up to half on faculty standing committees."

Edward O. Agre, Bismarck Junior College indicated: "We had a sign-carrying demonstration over academic freedom. We made no effort to stop them. It lasted for about 20 minutes. The whole matter was settled by letting the students sit in with faculty and board members to work out a satisfactory policy."

David A. McClurt, of Everett Community College suggested that "personnel should be available and avoid reactions to planned or suggested protests - anticipate student needs and be familiar with the whole picture of the student protest movement. If administrators act like executives of General Motors, then students will act like United Auto Workers."

CONCLUSIONS

1. Student unrest activities in the junior college were primarily in the form of non-physical protest.

2. Situations involving food service rules on dress and appearance, student publications and student representation in policy-making were subject most to protest activity.

3. Student representation in policy-making and student civil rights activities were the subjects of more defiant protest activities, expecially in the Southwest.

4. Twenty per cent of the respondents indicated that some faculty members took active roles in protest situations.

5. Responses as to appropriate actions for the college administration became more severe as protest activities became more defiant and disruptive.

6. Student Personnel departments have made plans relative to possible protest situations. Only 10% of the respondents indicated that no planning had been done.

7. Forty-five per cent of the responding institutions indicated that governing boards had taken no action relative to protest situations. Seventeen per cent had adopted some policy.

8. Fifty-five per cent of the colleges responding indicated that no legal opinion had been sought concerning institutional response to protest activity.

9. Respondents rated the non-residential nature of the junior colleges as the most important reason for a lack of protest in these institutions. Counseling, faculty accessibility and concern, and student activities were rated important or very important.

10. Home and community influences and part or full-time work were considered very important characteristics in the absence of protest activities at junior colleges.

11. Respondents agreed that attempting to meet students' needs and involving students in policy-making are very important factors in precluding student unrest from developing into protest activity.